REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Examiner's Answer mailed November 20, 2009, claims 1-20 were rejected. In response, Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the below-provided remarks.

For reference, claims 1, 3-7, 10, 11, 13, 15, 17, and 18 are amended. Each of these claims is amended to remove certain language from the claim, improve the language of the claim, improve the formatting of the claim, and/or recite additional limitations to clarify the language of the claim. Of note, claim 1 is amended to recite using correlation data to accompany the request, device identifier, acknowledgement, and confirmation communications. Claim 1 is also amended to recite the correlation data includes unique identification information associated with the device. Claims 10, 15, and 18 are each amended to recite one or more similar limitations. These amendments are supported, for example, by the original language of claim 3 ("wherein the request includes the correlation data for the device" (emphasis added)). Consequently, the indicated language of claim 3 is deleted. These amendments are also supported, for example, by the subject matter described in the specification at paragraph 30, lines 1-11 (page 10, lines 3-13) ("In order to identify device 26 without a device identifier, correlation data can be included with each message used in assigning the device identifier (i.e., request, device identifier, acknowledgement, and confirmation)" (emphasis added)).

Additionally, claim 21 is added to recite a value of the device identifier prior to the request is indicative of an unused status of the device identifier. This amendment is supported, for example, by the subject matter described in the specification at paragraph 39, lines 15-17 (page 15, lines 5-7).

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as purportedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner identifies several limitations at issue because the limitations appear to lack support in the specification.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's review of the claim language. Applicants submit amendments herein to remove the indicated limitations from the language of the claims. In particular, claim 1 is amended to remove the limitations related to excluding a mobile phone number, dynamically creating the device identifier by the server, and always associating the device identifier with the same device. One or more similar amendments are presented for claims 10, 15, and 18, as applicable. Also, claims 4 and 13 are amended to remove the limitations related to a device type that is not the manufacturer. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-20 were rejected based on one or more cited references. The cited reference(s) relied on in these rejections include:

Okano et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0062485, hereinafter Okano)
Aoyama et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0199265, hereinafter Aoyama)
Matsuda et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0133573, hereinafter Matsuda)
Poger et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,772,420, hereinafter Poger)
Meier (U.S. Pat. No. 7,096,273, hereinafter Meier)

In particular, claims 1, 2, 9-11, 14-16, and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okano in view of Aoyama. Claims 3-7, 12, 13, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okano and Aoyama in view of Matsuda, with Poger providing intrinsic evidence. Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okano and Aoyama in view of Meier. However, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable over Okano, Aoyama, Matsuda, Poger, and Meier for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Okano and Aoyama, separately or in combination with Matsuda, because the combination of cited references does not teach all of the limitations of the claim. Claim 1 recites:

> A method for assigning a device identifier to a device, the method comprising:
>
> receiving a request at a server from the device for the device identifier, wherein the request is accompanied by correlation data with unique identification information associated with the device;
>
> obtaining the device identifier, the device identifier being unique from device identifiers of other devices identified by the server and distinct from a network address of the device, wherein the device identifier is obtained at the server and associated by the server with the correlation data from the device in response to the request from the device;
>
> marking a status of the device identifier as pending;
>
> sending the device identifier to the device, wherein the device identifier is accompanied by the correlation data associated with the device;
>
> marking the status of the device identifier as in use after receiving an acknowledgment from the device, wherein the acknowledgement is accompanied by the correlation data associated with the device; and
>
> sending a confirmation to the device after the acknowledgment is received, wherein the confirmation is accompanied by the correlation data associated with the device.
>
> (Emphasis added.)

In contrast, the combination of Okano and Aoyama and Matsuda does not teach using correlation data with unique identification information associated with the device. Additionally, the combination of cited references does not teach using such correlation data to accompany the various communications between the device and the server, through confirmation from the server to the device.

For reference, the reasoning presented in the Examiner's Answer relies on Okano as generally teaching request, device identifier, acknowledgement and confirmation communications between a cable modem and a subscriber terminal. Examiner's Answer, 11/20/09, pages 5-6. However, Okano nevertheless does not teach using correlation data with unique identification information in such communications. Rather, Okano merely describes using a common internet protocol (IP) address that is common to all subscriber

terminals. Okano, paragraph 84, lines 5-10. The subscriber terminal uses the common IP address "0.0.0.0" which is a fixed value (initial value) common to all subscriber terminals because the subscriber terminal does not have a unique IP address allocated by the dynamic host configuration protocol (DHCP) server. Okano, paragraphs 83-84.

Moreover, with reference to the rejection of claim 3 of the present application, the reasoning presented in the Examiner's Answer explicitly acknowledges that Okano and Aoyama do not teach including correlation data in a request. Examiner's Answer, 11/20/09, page 11. Thus, Okano and Aoyama further fail to teach including correlation data with unique identification information in the request. Applicants submit that Okano and Aoyama similarly fail to teach including correlation data with unique identification information in other communications (e.g., device identifier, acknowledgement, confirmation) between the DHCP server and the subscriber terminal of Okano.

Matsuda fails to remedy this lack of teaching by Okano and Aoyama because Matsuda also fails to teach using correlation data with unique identification information in each of the indicated communications recited in the claim. In the previous rejection of claim 3 (which previously recited including correlation data in the request), the reasoning in the Examiner's Answer relied on Matsuda as teaching sending a suggested host name from a client networked office appliance (NOA) to a server NOA. Examiner's Answer, 11/20/09, page 11. Matsuda also describes sending configuration information, which may include the client's network name, from the server NOA to the client NOA after a suitable network name and network IP address are determined. Matsuda, paragraph 66. However, Matsuda nevertheless does not teach including the suggested host name in any other communications. Specifically, Matsuda does not teach including the suggested host name in an acknowledgement communication from the client NOA to the server NOA. Also, Matsuda does not teach including the suggested host name in a confirmation communication from the server NOA to the client NOA. Therefore, Matsuda also fails to teach using correlation data to accompany each of the communications recited in the claim.

For the reasons presented above, the combination of Okano and Aoyama and Matsuda does not teach all of the limitations of the claim because the combination of cited references does not teach using correlation data with unique identification

information in each of the indicated communications between a server and a device, as recited in the claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Okano and Aoyama and Matsuda because the combination of cited references does not teach all of the limitations of the claim.

Independent Claims 10, 15, and 18

Applicants respectfully assert independent claims 10, 15, and 18 are patentable over the combinations of cited references at least for similar reasons to those stated above in regard to the rejection of independent claim 1. Each of these claims recites subject matter which is similar to the subject matter of claim 1 discussed above. Although the language of these claims differs from the language of claim 1, and the scope of each claim should be interpreted independently of other claims, Applicants respectfully assert that the remarks provided above in regard to the rejection of claim 1 also apply to the rejections of these claims.

Dependent Claims

Claims 2-9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, and 19-21 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claims 1, 10, 15, and 18. Applicants respectfully assert claims 2-9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, and 19-21 are allowable based on allowable base claims. Additionally, each of claims 2-9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, and 19-21 may be allowable for further reasons.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **09-0461** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **09-0461** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey T. Holman/

Date: February 5, 2010

Jeffrey T. Holman
Reg. No. 51,812

Wilson Ham & Holman
175 South Main Street
Suite #850
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
Phone: (801) 746-5560
Fax: (801) 746-7451